

PRESS RELEASE

PCS 2000 announced today that it has filed a request for waiver of any withdrawal penalty associated with its erroneous bid of \$180,060,000 for the Norfolk BTA.

"It is quite clear from our bidding patterns and the bid itself that our intention was to bid the minimum required, \$18,006,000, but that an extra zero was added to the bid. While we have not been able to identify the source of the error," Mr. Lamoso said, "It is clear that a mistake was made."

Mr. Lamoso went on to state the company's hope and expectation that the Commission will not impose an impossible burden on the company, which would seriously affect its continued ability to bid, "Our hope," he said, "is that the Commission will recognize the inequity of such action, and instead agree to waive the penalty for these types of obvious errors."



RECYCLED

ALL STATES - LEGAL 900 222 0576 ED11

6. P.L.P. 12.0

WILKINSON, BARKER, KNAUER & QUINN
1735 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006-5289

TELEPHONE
(202) 783-4141

FAX
(202) 833-2360
(202) 783-5851

FAX TRANSMISSION COVER SHEET

DATE: January 25, 1996

CODE: 558


TO: Javier Lamoso, Fred Martinez, FAX NO.: 1-415-349-8150
Terry Easton, & Quentin Breen

FROM: Mike Sullivan

RE: Redraft of waiver request. It is very important that we file as soon as possible in order to (a) reassure the FCC and (b) meet press deadlines. Please call as soon as you have reviewed this and fax the executed declarations.

NUMBER OF PAGES: ____, INCLUDING THIS COVER SHEET.
PLEASE DELIVER TO ADDRESSEE IMMEDIATELY.

THIS FAX WAS SENT BY: ____



88

NOTICE

THIS MESSAGE IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE RECIPIENT(S) NAMED ABOVE. IT MAY CONTAIN INFORMATION THAT IS CONFIDENTIAL, SUBJECT TO ATTORNEY-CLIENT OR ATTORNEY WORK-PRODUCT PRIVILEGE, OR OTHERWISE PROTECTED BY LAW. IF YOU ARE NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, OR A PERSON RESPONSIBLE FOR DELIVERING THE MESSAGE TO THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED THAT ANY USE, DISSEMINATION, DISTRIBUTION OR COPYING OF THIS MESSAGE, OR THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN IT, IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS MESSAGE IN ERROR, PLEASE NOTIFY US IMMEDIATELY BY TELEPHONE AND RETURN IT TO US AT THE ABOVE ADDRESS BY FIRST-CLASS MAIL. RECEIPT BY ANY PERSON OTHER THAN THE INTENDED RECIPIENT

WILKINSON, BARKER, KNAUER & QUINN

LAW OFFICES

1735 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20006-5209

(202) 783-4141

TELECOPIER

(202) 783-5851
(202) 633-2360

GERMAN OFFICE

GOETHESTRASSE 23
60313 FRANKFURT A.M., GERMANY
011-49-69-20876
011-49-69-297-8453 (TELECOPIER)

January 26, 1996

William F. Caton, Acting Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, N.W., Room 222
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: PCS 2000, L.P.
Block C PCS Auction
Request for Expedited Waiver or Reduction of Withdrawal Penalty

Attention: Kathleen Ham
Chief, Auction Division
Wireless Telecommunications Bureau

Dear Mr. Caton:

On January 23, 1995, PCS 2000, L.P. ("PCS 2000") erroneously submitted a bid in the Block C PCS auction for Market B324 for a price ten times as high as it intended. It informed the Commission immediately upon discovering the error and withdrew the bid the next day. PCS 2000 now asks the Commission to waive its withdrawal penalty rule. Imposing a penalty *potentially as large as \$162 million* on PCS 2000, a small business owned and controlled by women and minorities, for an *innocent error* will both destroy the company's ability to continue its aggressive participation in the auction and chill the willingness of other small businesses and entrepreneurs to bid.

Accordingly, PCS 2000 requests, pursuant to Section 24.819(a)(1) of the Rules, a waiver of the bid withdrawal penalty imposed by Section 24.704(a)(1) of the Rules for PCS 2000's withdrawal of its erroneous high bid of \$180,060,000 for the Block C license in Market B324 in Round 11. In the alternative, PCS 2000 requests that the penalty be very substantially reduced. PCS 2000 respectfully requests that action be expedited so that a resolution is achieved while the auction is ongoing. Delaying action until after the close of the auction would adversely affect the outcome of the auction.

Background

In Round 11 of the Block C PCS auction, PCS 2000 entered bids for a number of markets, including Market B324. For each of these selected markets, PCS 2000 intended to, and believed at the time that it did, enter the minimum bid increment. For Market B324, the minimum bid increment would have resulted in a bid of \$18,006,000.00. Due to an error, the bid for this market was recorded by the Commission as \$180,060,000.00, exactly ten times as large as the intended bid. PCS 2000 discovered the error about two hours after the close of the bidding for Round 11, when it downloaded the round results from the FCC's internet FTP server. PCS 2000 immediately telephoned the FCC's auction contractor to indicate that it had intended to bid \$18,006,000.00 and to report that the \$180,060,000 bid was in error. Undersigned counsel also contacted officials of the Auction Division to inform them of the error. The Commission verified that the bid had been posted as received, and PCS 2000 withdrew the erroneous high bid of \$180,060,000.00 on January 24, 1996.

PCS 2000 has conducted a preliminary investigation of the error, but the precise cause of the erroneous bid remains unknown. The error appears to have occurred in PCS 2000's bid preparation and submission process and was likely caused by some combination of a departure from previously established internal procedures, human error, and the inability to conduct a complete cross-check of the submitted bids against other data prior to the conclusion of the bidding period because of a lack of time. In addition, discovery of the error was delayed because the FCC's confirmation of the bid was not received due to a printer malfunction. PCS 2000 is undertaking measures to ensure that there is no recurrence of these conditions.

PCS 2000 notes that some press reports have erroneously claimed that PCS 2000 attributes the error to the Commission. Because the results reported by the FCC did not reflect the bid that PCS 2000 believed it had submitted, the company contacted the FCC to determine whether an error had occurred in reporting the results. The FCC confirmed that it reported the results that had been submitted, and PCS 2000 has now concluded, as discussed above, that the error occurred in its own bid preparation and submission process and was *not* attributable to the Commission.

Discussion

PCS 2000 submits that the public interest would be served by grant of a waiver (or, in the alternative, a substantial reduction in the penalty) in the unique circumstances of the instant case, that strict application of the prescribed penalty for withdrawing a bid would disserve the public interest, and that the purpose of the rule would not be undermined by a waiver. Prompt resolution of this is essential, because the lack of a decision will severely limit the ability of PCS 2000 to continue its active and aggressive participation in the auction and could adversely affect the willingness of other bidders to participate.

Waiver of the penalty rule under these circumstances would not establish a precedent that would create any opportunity for mischief in the future. The bid submitted in error by PCS 2000 was clearly in error and not an attempt to manipulate the bidding. The \$180,060,000.00 bid represented a per-pop price of \$110, which is vastly in excess of the likely value of this license. Indeed, the erroneous bid exceeded the previous high bid by 900%, at a time when PCS 2000 (and many other bidders) were making only the minimum bids necessary. All of PCS 2000's bids in Round 11, except the erroneous bid for Market B234, were the minimum permissible bid, and the erroneous bid was exactly ten times the minimum permissible bid of \$18,006,000.00. It is obvious that an extra zero was somehow accidentally added to the end of the bid amount. No reasonable bidder would have knowingly bid such a price for this license.

PCS 2000 promptly took steps to notify the Commission that an error appeared to have occurred. As Mr. Easton indicates in his declaration, immediately upon discovering that the FCC had recorded the bid as being \$180,060,000.00, he informed Mr. Louis Segalos, an official with the Commission's auction contractor, that an error had occurred. He supplied Mr. Segalos with copies of spreadsheet printouts indicating the bids that PCS 2000 believed it had submitted. Shortly thereafter, counsel informed the Auctions Division staff of the error. The erroneous bid was then withdrawn on January 24, 1996.

The Commission adopted its bid withdrawal penalty rules to deter "[i]nsincere bidding, whether purely frivolous or strategic." *Competitive Bidding*, PP Docket 93-253, *Second Report and Order*, 9 F.C.C.R. 2348, 2373 (1994). Allowing the prompt withdrawal of a clearly erroneous bid without penalty will have no effect on the Commission's ability to penalize those who submit frivolous bids or bids that are part of a manipulative strategy. There is no indication in the *Second Report and Order* that the Commission intended to impose the bid withdrawal penalty on those who withdraw bids that were clearly submitted in error.

Moreover, the level of the bid withdrawal penalty that the Commission adopted was specifically selected in order to take advantage of marketplace incentives by bidders who would consider the penalty as a price component. The Commission never considered the possibility that a bid might be submitted in error for many times the market value of the license. The Commission stated:

A point to note in considering the appropriate level of bid withdrawal penalty is that the market generally places an upper limit on the amount that bidders will pay to the government for bid withdrawal. If the bid withdrawal penalty is too high, winning bidders who realize they bid too much will generally pay for the license and resell it in the after-market. The cost of doing this would be the difference between the bid price and the price obtained in the after-market

9 F.C.C.R. at 2373. These economic calculations are relevant only to the intentional submission of an excessive bid and its subsequent withdrawal, not to the withdrawal of a bid erroneously submitted for an amount ten times as high as intended.

In establishing the bid withdrawal penalty, the Commission was particularly sensitive to the financial circumstances of designated entities, who it noted "are less likely to have the option of purchasing a license and reselling it as an alternative to bid withdrawal." *Id.* In the case of a grossly excessive bid submitted in error, a capital-constrained designated entity can neither buy the license at the bid price for resale nor pay a penalty amounting to many times the value of the license. It is noteworthy in this connection that the Commission recognized that "requiring the forfeiture of all funds on deposit with the Commission could, in some cases, be too severe a penalty." In the instant case, the funds PCS 2000 has on deposit (which constitute the majority of PCS 2000's assets) would cover only a fraction of the penalty. Forfeiture of these funds would render this designated entity unable to pay for *any* licenses for which it may be the high bidder. Thus, application of the rules would have a result directly contrary to the purpose for which the rules were adopted.

None of the participants in the C Block auction would be able to pay a penalty of this magnitude. It would vastly exceed the \$50 million upfront payment posted by PCS 2000 (and indeed would exceed any Block C bidder's upfront payment) and would, if not waived, render the company unable to acquire any licenses. Other bidders in the auction would be similarly affected by a penalty were they to make a similar mistake. Prompt action on this matter is needed to avoid chilling participation in the auction.

It is important to recognize that if PCS 2000 is subjected to this unduly burdensome penalty, its bidding capacity will be drastically reduced, if not eliminated. As a result, less money will be involved in the auction and licenses may well be undervalued. This would lead to spectrum being assigned on a less than optimal economic basis, instead of being assigned to those valuing most highly. A prompt waiver of the rule would ensure the integrity of the auction process as a whole and minimize any disruption to this process.

PCS 2000 regrets that the error occurred. Nevertheless, no party has suffered any harm as a result of the erroneous bid or its withdrawal. The error occurred relatively early in the auction and the bid was promptly withdrawn. As a result, any party wishing to bid for the market involved is able to do so.

In the event the Commission does not waive the withdrawal bid penalty rule entirely, PCS 2000 respectfully requests that the penalty be reduced very substantially. The Commission never anticipated that a bidder might be subjected to a penalty vastly exceeding the value of the license for which it had bid. A bidder who engages in strategic bidding to close out another bidder and then withdraws its bid will be liable for a penalty that represents a small fraction of the license's value. No public interest would be served by imposing a far greater penalty on a bidder who withdraws an erroneous bid. The Communications Act does not contain specific provisions governing the

penalties that may be imposed as part of the auction process, but the provisions of Section 503 concerning monetary forfeitures for serious violations of the Act place a limit of \$100,000 on the penalty that may be assessed for any single violation by a common carrier. *See* 47 U.S.C. § 503(b)(2)(B). It would clearly be inappropriate to impose a greater penalty for withdrawal of an erroneous bid than for willful violation of the Communications Act.

Accordingly, PCS 2000 submits that waiver of the rule (or, in the alternative, a substantial reduction in the bid withdrawal penalty) is warranted in the public interest and should be granted without delay.

Sincerely,

Wilkinson, Barker, Knauer & Quinn

By: Michael Deuel Sullivan

Counsel for PCS 2000, L.P.

cc: Kathleen O'Brian Ham
Gerald P. Vaughan



WILKINSON, BARKER, KNAUER & QUINN**LAW OFFICES**

1735 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20006-5209

(202) 783-4141

TELECOPIER

(202) 783-5851
(202) 833-2360

GERMAN OFFICE

GOETHESTRASSE 23

60313 FRANKFURT A.M. GERMANY

011-49-69-20876

011-49-69-297-8453 (TELECOPIER)

January 26, 1996

RECEIVED

JAN 26 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

William F. Caton, Acting Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, N.W., Room 222
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: PCS 2000, L.P.
Block C PCS Auction
Request for Expedited Waiver or Reduction of Withdrawal Penalty

Attention: Kathleen Ham
Chief, Auction Division
Wireless Telecommunications Bureau

Dear Mr. Caton

On January 23, 1995, PCS 2000, L.P. ("PCS 2000") erroneously submitted a bid in the Block C PCS auction for Market B324 for a price ten times as high as it intended. It informed the Commission immediately upon discovering the error and withdrew the bid the next day. PCS 2000 now asks the Commission to waive its withdrawal penalty rule. Imposing a penalty *potentially as large as \$162 million* on PCS 2000, a small business owned and controlled by women and minorities, for an *innocent error* will both destroy the company's ability to continue its aggressive participation in the auction and chill the willingness of other small businesses and entrepreneurs to bid.

Accordingly, PCS 2000 requests, pursuant to Section 24.819(a)(1) of the Rules, a waiver of the bid withdrawal penalty imposed by Section 24.704(a)(1) of the Rules for PCS 2000's withdrawal of its erroneous high bid of \$180,060,000 for the Block C license in Market B324 in Round 11. In the alternative, PCS 2000 requests that the penalty be very substantially reduced. PCS 2000 respectfully requests that action be expedited so that a resolution is achieved while the auction is ongoing. Delaying action until after the close of the auction would adversely affect the outcome of the auction.

Background

In Round 11 of the Block C PCS auction, PCS 2000 entered new bids for 38 markets, including Market B324. For each of these selected markets, PCS 2000 intended to, and believed at the time that it did, enter the minimum bid increment. For Market B324, the minimum bid increment would have resulted in a bid of \$18,006,000.00. Due to an error, the bid for this market was recorded by the Commission as \$180,060,000.00, exactly ten times as large as the intended bid. PCS 2000 discovered the error about two hours after the close of the bidding for Round 11, when it downloaded the round results from the FCC's internet FTP server. PCS 2000 immediately telephoned the FCC's auction contractor to indicate that it had intended to bid \$18,006,000.00 and to report that the \$180,060,000 bid was in error. Undersigned counsel also contacted officials of the Auction Division to inform them of the error. The Commission verified that the bid had been posted as received, and on January 24, 1996, in the very next round, PCS 2000 withdrew the erroneous high bid of \$180,060,000.00.

PCS 2000 has conducted a preliminary investigation of the error, but the precise cause of the erroneous bid remains unknown. The error appears to have occurred in PCS 2000's bid preparation and submission process and was likely caused by some combination of a departure from previously established internal procedures, human error, and the inability to conduct a complete cross-check of the submitted bids against other data prior to the conclusion of the bidding period because of a lack of time. In addition, discovery of the error was delayed because the FCC's confirmation of the bid was not received due to a print server malfunction. PCS 2000 is undertaking measures to ensure that there is no recurrence of these conditions.

PCS 2000 notes that some press reports have erroneously claimed that PCS 2000 attributes the error to the Commission. Because the results reported by the FCC did not reflect the bid that PCS 2000 believed it had submitted, the company contacted the FCC to determine whether an error had occurred in reporting the results. The FCC confirmed that it reported the results that had been submitted, and PCS 2000 continued on with its investigation of its internal processes. PCS 2000 has now concluded, as discussed above, that the error occurred in its own bid preparation and submission process. PCS 2000 does not attribute this error to the Commission.

Discussion

PCS 2000 submits that the public interest would be served by grant of a waiver (or, in the alternative, a substantial reduction in the penalty) in the unique circumstances of the instant case, that strict application of the prescribed penalty for withdrawing a bid would disserve the public interest, and that the purpose of the rule would not be undermined by a waiver (Section 24.918(a)(1)). Prompt resolution of this is essential, because the lack of a decision will severely limit the ability of PCS 2000 to continue its active and aggressive participation in the auction and could adversely affect the willingness of other bidders to participate.

Waiver of the penalty rule under these circumstances would not establish a precedent that would create any opportunity for mischief in the future. The bid submitted in error by PCS 2000 was clearly in error and not an attempt to manipulate the bidding. The \$180,060,000.00 bid represented a per-pop price of \$110, which is vastly in excess of the likely value of this license. Indeed, the erroneous bid exceeded the previous high bid by 900%, at a time when PCS 2000 (and many other bidders) were making only the minimum bids necessary. All of PCS 2000's bids in Round 11, except the erroneous bid for Market B234, were the minimum permissible bid, and the erroneous bid was exactly ten times the minimum permissible bid of \$18,006,000.00. It is obvious that an extra zero was somehow accidentally added to the end of the bid amount. No reasonable bidder would have knowingly bid such a price for this license.

PCS 2000 promptly took steps to notify the Commission that an error appeared to have occurred. As Mr. Easton indicates in his declaration, immediately upon discovering that the FCC had recorded the bid as being \$180,060,000.00, he informed Mr. Louis Segalos, an FCC auction official, that an error had occurred. He supplied Mr. Segalos with copies of spreadsheet printouts indicating the bids that PCS 2000 believed it had submitted. Shortly thereafter, counsel informed senior Auctions Division staff officials of the error. The erroneous bid was then withdrawn on January 24, 1996, during the next bidding round after the error was discovered.

The Commission adopted its bid withdrawal penalty rules to deter "[i]nsincere bidding, whether purely frivolous or strategic." *Competitive Bidding*, PP Docket 93-253, *Second Report and Order*, 9 F C C R 2348, 2373 (1994). The bid in question was neither frivolous nor strategic; it was, instead, clearly inadvertent and erroneous. Allowing the prompt withdrawal of a clearly erroneous bid without penalty will have no effect on the Commission's ability to penalize those who submit frivolous bids or bids that are part of a manipulative strategy. There is no indication in the *Second Report and Order* that the Commission intended to impose the bid withdrawal penalty on those who withdraw bids that were clearly submitted in error.

Moreover, the nature of the bid withdrawal penalty that the Commission adopted was specifically selected in order to take advantage of marketplace incentives by bidders who would consider the penalty as a price component. The Commission never considered the possibility that a bid might be submitted in error for many times the market value of the license. The Commission stated

A point to note in considering the appropriate level of bid withdrawal penalty is that the market generally places an upper limit on the amount that bidders will pay to the government for bid withdrawal. If the bid withdrawal penalty is too high, winning bidders who realize they bid too much will generally pay for the license and resell it in the after-market. The cost of doing this would be the difference between the bid price and the price obtained in the after-market.

9 F.C.C.R. at 2373. These economic calculations are relevant only to the intentional submission of an excessive bid and its subsequent withdrawal, not to the withdrawal of a bid erroneously submitted for an amount ten times as high as intended.

In establishing the bid withdrawal penalty, the Commission was particularly sensitive to the financial circumstances of designated entities, who it noted "are less likely to have the option of purchasing a license and reselling it as an alternative to bid withdrawal." *Id.* In the case of a grossly excessive bid submitted in error, a capital-constrained designated entity can neither buy the license at the bid price for resale nor pay a penalty amounting to many times the value of the license. It is noteworthy in this connection that the Commission recognized that "requiring the forfeiture of all funds on deposit with the Commission could, in some cases, be too severe a penalty." In the instant case, the funds PCS 2000 has on deposit would cover only a fraction of the penalty. A forfeiture of this magnitude would render this designated entity unable to pay for *any* licenses for which it may be the high bidder. Thus, application of the rules would have a result directly contrary to the purpose for which the rules were adopted.

None of the participants in the C Block auction would be able to pay a penalty of this magnitude. It would vastly exceed the \$50 million upfront payment posted by PCS 2000 (and indeed would exceed any Block C bidder's upfront payment) and would, if not waived, render the company unable to acquire any licenses. Other bidders in the auction would be similarly affected by a penalty were they to make a similar mistake. Prompt action on this matter is needed to avoid chilling participation in the auction.

It is important to recognize that if PCS 2000 is subjected to this unduly burdensome penalty, its bidding capacity will be drastically reduced, if not eliminated. As a result, less money will be involved in the auction and licenses may well be undervalued. This would lead to spectrum being assigned on a less than optimal economic basis, instead of being assigned to those valuing most highly. A prompt waiver of the rule would ensure the integrity of the auction process as a whole and minimize any disruption to this process.

PCS 2000 regrets that the error occurred. Nevertheless, no party has suffered any harm as a result of the erroneous bid or its withdrawal. The error occurred relatively early in the auction and the bid was promptly withdrawn. Moreover, the amount bid was so obviously in error that no party could seriously have considered it as a strategic assessment by PCS 2000 of the value of the license. As a result, any party wishing to make a good faith bid for the market involved was, and remains able to do so virtually unfettered by the effect of the withdrawn bid.

In the event the Commission does not waive the withdrawal bid penalty rule entirely, PCS 2000 respectfully requests that the penalty be reduced very substantially, to a level more appropriately considering the true impact of PCS 2000's actions on the legitimacy of the auction for the Norfolk BTA license. The Commission never anticipated that a bidder might be subjected to a penalty vastly exceeding the value of the license for which it had bid. A bidder who engages in

January 26, 1996


Page 5

strategic bidding to adversely impact or even close out another bidder and then withdraws its bid may be liable for a penalty that represents a small fraction of the license's value. No public interest would be served by imposing a far greater penalty on a bidder who bids an obviously erroneous amount and then must withdraw such an erroneous bid. The Communications Act does not contain specific provisions governing the penalties that may be imposed as part of the auction process; by way of analogy, however, the provisions of Section 503 concerning monetary forfeitures for serious violations of the Act place a limit of \$100,000 on the penalty that may be assessed for any single violation by a common carrier. *See* 47 U.S.C. § 503(b)(2)(B). It would clearly be inappropriate to impose a forfeiture penalty for withdrawal of an erroneous bid that is of such substantial magnitude greater than the penalties that Congress has mandated for willful violation of the Communications Act.

Accordingly, PCS 2000 submits that waiver of the rule (or, in the alternative, a substantial reduction in the bid withdrawal penalty) is warranted in the public interest and should be granted without delay.

Sincerely,

Wilkinson, Barker, Knauer & Quinn

By  Michael Deuel Sullivan

Counsel for PCS 2000, L.P


Enclosures

cc Kathleen Ham
Gerald P. Vaughan

Declaration of Javier Lamoso

I, Javier Lamoso, am the President of Unicom Corporation, the general partner in PCS 2000, L.P. I have read the foregoing "Request for Expedited Waiver or Reduction of Withdrawal Penalty" and declare under penalty of perjury that the statements therein are true and correct, on information and belief.

Executed: January 26, 1996

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "J. Lamoso", is written over a horizontal line.

Declaration of Anthony T. Easton

I, Anthony T. Easton, am the Chief Executive Officer of Unicom Corporation, the general partner in PCS 2000, L.P.

I have read the foregoing "Request for Expedited Waiver or Reduction of Withdrawal Penalty" and the statements therein are true and correct to the best of my knowledge.


I supervised the preparation and submission of PCS 2000's bids for Round 11 of the C Block PCS auction, in which a bid was erroneously submitted for Market R324 in the amount of \$180,060,000 instead of the minimum bid of \$18,006,000. While PCS 2000 has been unable to determine the precise manner in which the error occurred, there are a number of ways in which the error could have occurred, in light of a departure, during Round 11, from the internal bidding procedures normally followed. The source of the error is likely to have been either (1) human error in entering data into the spreadsheet program PCS 2000 uses to prepare its bids, (2) an error introduced in the course of manually changing bids on-line in real time, or (3) an error introduced in transferring the data file between our computers on our local network or in transmitting the file over the bidding network.

Normally, any such error would have been discovered and corrected during multiple cross-checking processes. Unfortunately, during Round 11 these cross-checking processes were not followed fully, because it became necessary to manually change certain bids on-line shortly before the close of the bidding round in order to comply with bidding eligibility and activity rules. As a result, there was not sufficient time to recheck the details of every bid. In addition, both the network print server and the fax server that normally print the FCC confirmation of bids received were functioning erratically due to an insufficient disk space problem caused by the overload of the buffer

area by several twelve to fifteen page faxes, as a result of which PCS 2000 did not receive any confirmation that would have timely alerted the company to the error.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct, based on personal knowledge and on information and belief.

Executed: January 26, 1996

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Anthony T. Barker", written over a horizontal line.



RECYCLED

ALL-STATE™ LEGAL 800-222-0510 ED11

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD

1615 L STREET, N.W., SUITE 1200
WASHINGTON, DC. 20036-5610

202 466-6300
FAX 202 463-0678
TELEX 989966

CHICAGO
312 372-1121
FAX 312 372-2098

June 4, 1997

HAND DELIVERED

Howard C. Davenport, Chief
Enforcement Division
Wireless Telecommunications Bureau
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D. C. 20554

Myron C. Peck, Deputy Chief
Enforcement Division
Wireless Telecommunications Bureau
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D. C. 20554

Joseph Paul Weber, Esquire
Enforcement Division
Wireless Telecommunications Bureau
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D. C. 20554

Re: Quentin L. Breen
Westel, L.P.
Westel Samoa, Inc.

Gentlemen:

As you are aware, this firm represents Quentin L. Breen with regard to the events surrounding the C Block Broadband PCS Round 11 Norfolk, Virginia BTA auction bid submitted by PCS 2000, L.P. ("PCS 2000") on January 23, 1996 ("Bidding Error"). This firm also represents Westel Samoa, Inc. and Westel, L.P. (collectively "Westel"), of which entities Mr. Breen is a principal, with regard to their respective pending C and F Block Broadband PCS applications. The Commission, in the "Notice of Apparent Liability for Forfeiture" issued in the PCS 2000 proceeding, indicated that any impact of the Bidding Error on Mr. Breen's qualifications to be a Commission licensee would be examined in the context of the Westel applications.¹ We are aware, and you have acknowledged, that, at least since the issuance of the NAL, you have been conducting an investigation of the Bidding Error. This submission is being delivered to you so as to assist you in that investigation.

¹ PCS 2000, L.P., 12 FCC Rd. 1703, 1718 (1997) ("NAL").

Howard Davenport, Chief
Myron C. Peck, Deputy Chief
Joseph Paul Weber, Esquire
Enforcement Division
June 4, 1997
Page 2

From all indications to date, the Commission and the Bureau place substantial reliance on the February 19, 1996, report on the Bidding Error, which report was prepared by the law firm of Young, Vogl, Harlick, Wilson & Simpson, LLP, and submitted to the Commission by PCS 2000 ("Report"). While we believe that most of the facts presented in the Report are substantially correct in most material respects,² we also believe it would be imprudent, unfair, unwarranted and an abdication of responsibility for either the Bureau or the Commission simply to adopt the Report's characterizations and conclusions, many of which are not well founded and, therefore, are inaccurate or incorrect. It should not surprise the Commission or the Bureau that there are deficiencies in the Report's characterizations and conclusions, because the Report, itself, warned:³

This Report was prepared on an extremely tight time schedule. Its contents are based solely on the information we were able to develop during the brief period from February 9 through February 16 [1996], and such information is necessarily incomplete. Moreover, the complexities of the Company's computer systems and processes, combined with the substantially inconsistent versions of events recounted by key participants, made the investigation particularly challenging. It is in this context that the reader should consider the conclusions and reasoning [of the Report].

And the Commission acknowledged that, "[i]n contrast to Mr. [Anthony T.] Easton, [at time of the NAL] the Commission does not know the full extent of Mr. Breen's involvement in the deception."⁴ In the face of warnings from both the Report and this submission, and in light of the Commission's stated concern as to the completeness of the record, it is incumbent on the Commission and the Bureau to avoid undue reliance on the Report's characterizations and conclusions when considering Westel's applications or Mr. Breen's qualifications. In addition, the

² Of course, where the Report presents inconsistent or contradictory factual assertions or contentions, or where the Report notes that an individual has taken exception to another's version of the facts, such facts cannot be taken as settled.

³ Report, at p. 1, emphasis added.

⁴ NAL, at 1717, emphasis in original.

Howard Davenport, Chief
Myron C. Peck, Deputy Chief
Joseph Paul Webber, Esquire
Enforcement Division
June 4, 1997
Page 3

Commission and the Bureau, in reviewing Westel's applications and Mr. Breen's qualifications, must consider the additional facts provided by the attached declarations, which facts either were not perceived by the Report's authors, or were ignored by those authors.

The Commission has indicated it is concerned specifically about Mr. Breen's candor. That concern is based on a perception derived from the Report that Mr. Breen was "aware of Mr. Easton's actions," but did not cause them to be reported to the Commission.⁵ In accusing Mr. Breen of possibly having lacked candor as to facts of which he is believed to have been "aware", the Report, and the Commission in reliance on the Report, reached conclusions as to both the knowledge and state of mind of Mr. Breen. Where, as here, so much depends on an individual's perception and state of mind, it is essential that chronology, sequence, nuance, and the quantity and quality of information be given proper consideration. It is submitted that any fair and objective review and consideration of the attached declarations of Mr. Breen and Cynthia L. Hamilton will illuminate, clarify, or conclusively rebut certain erroneous characterizations and conclusions set forth in the Report. And any open-minded reexamination of Mr. Breen's activities in light of those declarations will compel a determination that Mr. Breen did not lack candor with regard to the Bidding Error.

Any objective examination of Mr. Breen's qualifications should start, and probably should end, at the focal point of the Commission's concern regarding Mr. Breen: the January 26, 1996, meeting between Ms. Hamilton and Mr. Breen.⁶ Neither Ms. Hamilton nor Mr. Breen had planned the meeting; it was completely spontaneous.⁷ And it was not a lengthy or intense meeting; it

⁵ Id.

⁶ There has been absolutely no indication that Mr. Breen had any first-hand knowledge of Mr. Easton's activities. As noted in the Report, and as confirmed by Mr. Breen's attached Declaration, Mr. Breen was not present at the times "Mr. Easton's actions" were perpetrated.

⁷ One of the unjust ironies of this matter is that, had Mr. Breen simply ignored Ms. Hamilton's arrival at SMG on January 26, 1996, his conduct would not today be a subject of controversy. But, because he diligently and conscientiously initiated contact

Howard Davenport, Chief
Myron C. Peck, Deputy Chief
Joseph Paul Weber, Esquire
Enforcement Division
June 4, 1997
Page 4

was brief and touched on several personal matters in addition to the Bidding Error. During the meeting, Ms. Hamilton, who had not anticipated encountering Mr. Breen, made a purely extemporaneous presentation, presumably based on what she had observed before her January 23, 1996 departure from the offices of the San Mateo Group ("SMG"). Because of her acknowledged concern about retaliation by Mr. Easton, however, Ms. Hamilton refrained from speaking openly; she was "circumspect". She chose to not even mention to Mr. Breen that she had been able to save vital documentary evidence, much less that she had seen fit to bring such evidence to the attention of the Commission. On the other hand, Mr. Breen brought to his unanticipated meeting with Ms. Hamilton certain preconceptions derived from three days of involvement in PCS 2000's ongoing examination of the Bidding Error; three days during which Ms. Hamilton had been absent from SMG's offices. He also was aware of the content and intent of PCS 2000's waiver request, which had already been filed with the Commission in Washington by the time Ms. Hamilton and Mr. Easton met in San Mateo. The tenor and context of the Hamilton-Breen meeting portrayed in both declarations certainly gives credence to Mr. Breen's statement that he "perceived no material inconsistencies between what Ms. Hamilton told [him] on January 26, 1996, and the representations in the waiver request PCS 2000 had filed earlier that day."³ The only reasonable conclusion

with Ms. Hamilton, even though he knew she had a negative view of the events of January 23, 1996 (to the extent she had resigned from her job without any apparent assurance of other immediate employment), Mr. Breen now finds his conduct and motives being second-guessed by some claiming the benefits of 20/20 hindsight, but, actually hampered by 20/20 tunnel vision. If one now seeks to judge Mr. Breen's conduct, one must consider the broad context of that conduct; selective recollection cannot be tolerated.

³ Michael Duell Sullivan, of the law firm of Wilkinson, Barker, Knauer & Quinn, is the communications attorney who advised and assisted PCS 2000 in the immediate wake of the Bidding Error, and particularly in the preparation of the "Request for Waiver" filed with the Commission on January 26, 1996. You interviewed Mr. Sullivan on March 20, 1997, at which interview the undersigned was present. It is suggested that the information imparted to you by Mr. Sullivan in the course of that interview gives further credence to Mr. Breen's statement that he "perceived no material inconsistencies between what Ms. Hamilton told [him] on January 26, 1996, and the representations in the

Howard Davenport, Chief
Myron C. Peck, Deputy Chief
Joseph Paul Weber, Esquire
Enforcement Division
June 4, 1997
Page 5

one can fairly draw from the various portrayals of the Hamilton-Breen meeting is that, as a result of their differing perspectives, two conscientious and well-intentioned people attributed very different meanings to the same conversation. Colloquially stated, while Ms. Hamilton sought to tell Mr. Breen about "apples", he perceived her to be talking about "oranges". In any event, because Mr. Breen certainly was not made "aware of Mr. Easton's actions" as a result of his meeting with Ms. Hamilton, he cannot be found to have lacked candor for failing to reveal that which he did not perceive.

Although we would expect a fair and objective examination of the Hamilton-Breen meeting to fully exonerate Mr. Breen, we must caution the Commission against following the Report into an unwarranted comparison between Mr. Breen's response to his meeting with Ms. Hamilton, and Javier Lamoso's response to Ms. Hamilton's subsequent telephone conversation with Mr. Lamoso. Any such comparison is invalid and unfair, in part because of the very different circumstances surrounding Ms. Hamilton's respective encounters with each of those gentlemen, and because there were enormous differences in both the quantity and the quality of the information Ms. Hamilton imparted to each of them. Ms. Hamilton had not planned to meet with Mr. Breen, but she initiated her telephone conversation with Mr. Lamoso. When Ms. Hamilton met with Mr. Breen, she was "circumspect". When she called Mr. Lamoso, she was direct and emphatic. Ms. Hamilton "did not even give Mr. Breen an indication that any documentary evidence still existed." Ms. Hamilton not only told Mr. Lamoso that she had relevant documents she had rescued from the SMG offices, she also informed him she had provided copies of the documents to the Commission (and she made arrangements to send Mr. Lamoso copies by facsimile). Is it any wonder that Mr. Breen and Mr. Lamoso had different reactions to their respective conversations with Ms. Hamilton? This recitation does not in any way diminish Mr. Lamoso's unquestioned integrity, nor should it. Instead, these facts simply show that Mr. Breen's reaction was not comparable to Mr. Lamoso's because their respective encounters with Ms. Hamilton were not comparable, either in form or in substance. The reactions of these two men were not the same because the stimuli were not the same. Accordingly, there is no valid reason to judge Mr. Breen and Mr. Lamoso on a comparative basis. Instead, each man's reaction should be recognized and accepted for what it was: an appropriate and

waiver request PCS 2000 had filed earlier that day."

Howard Davenport, Chief
Myron C. Peck, Deputy Chief
Joseph Paul Weber, Esquire
Enforcement Division
June 4, 1997
Page 6

legitimate response to the quantity and quality of information presented to him.

We are submitting these materials for your use in your investigation(s) of the Bidding Error, Mr. Breen or Westel. However, because of the generally non-public nature of agency investigations, these materials have not been tendered through the Office of the Secretary, but, instead, are being delivered directly to you, the members of the Commission's Staff whom we understand to be responsible for conducting an appropriate investigation of the Bidding Error. We understand that, by our proceeding in this manner, it will be within the Bureau's discretion to determine whether and when these materials should be made part of the public record in the Westel application proceedings (or in any other proceeding to which the Bureau or the Commission may deem them relevant). In that light, we are assuming that, by our delivery of these materials to you, they will be viewed as part of the record before the Bureau and the Commission during any consideration of the Bidding Error, including any consideration of the Bidding Error's implications for the Westel application proceedings.² If our assumption in this regard is not correct, please so notify us in order that we may effectuate a formal submission of these materials to the public record in the Westel application proceedings. Absent any notification from you to the contrary, we will assume that these materials will be considered by any and all components of the Commission which may consider the Bidding Error in any context.¹⁰

² Our records reflect that the Commission has assigned the Westel applications the following file numbers: 00560-CW-L-96; 00129-CW-L-97; 00862-CW-L-97; 00863-CW-L-97; 00864-CW-L-97; 00865-CW-L-97; and 00866-CW-L-97.

¹⁰ This submission is intended solely for use in connection with your investigation, which is focussed on the Bidding Error. Because this submission has not been formally directed to the Westel application proceedings, and because the petition of National Telecom PCS, Inc. ("NatTel") against the C Block application of Westel Samoa did not address the Bidding Error, and in light of NatTel's "Withdrawal of Supplement to Petition to Deny" disclaiming any interest in the Bidding Error, we do not believe service upon NatTel is required. Therefore, NatTel has not been served with a copy of this submission. However, if you have any reason to be concerned that the Commission's ex parte

Howard Davenport, Chief
Myron C. Peck, Deputy Chief
Joseph Paul Weber, Esquire
Enforcement Division
June 4, 1997
Page 7

Although we have attempted to be thorough in conducting an investigation of the Bidding Error on behalf of Mr. Breen and Westel, we cannot claim that our efforts have exhausted all potential sources. Certain resources available to the Commission have not been available to us (e.g., compulsory process or the threat of compulsory process). And, not surprisingly, continuing controversy and litigation between Mr. Breen and Mr. Easton have presented insurmountable obstacles to obtaining any information of probative value from that quarter. Also, in some instances, we have forborne from contacting witnesses identified in the Report (e.g., Rosalyn Makris) because their testimony would be merely cumulative to that of another, more critical witness. Despite these limitations, we believe our investigation and this submission have brought to light critical information sufficient to allow the Commission to determine that Mr. Breen and Westel possess the qualifications required of Commission licensees.

Should the Commission or its Staff still have questions regarding, or would benefit from further clarification of, any matters surrounding the Bidding Error, Mr. Breen stands ready to revisit those matters in an attempt to further facilitate the Commission's review of the matter. If the Commission or the Bureau wish to avail themselves of Mr. Breen's offer in this regard, please contact either of the undersigned.

Sincerely,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD

By:


A. Thomas Carroccio

By:


Ross A. Buntrock

cc: William E. Kennard, Esquire
Peter A. Tenhula, Esquire

rules may require that NatTel be served with a copy of this submission, we will undertake to serve NatTel immediately upon being informed that you have a concern in this regard.